



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/650,466	08/27/2003	Bo Wu	18866-707	7107

21971 7590 02/24/2006

WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI  
650 PAGE MILL ROAD  
PALO ALTO, CA 94304-1050

EXAMINER

BLACKWELL, JAMES H

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 02/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/650,466	<b>Applicant(s)</b> WU ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> James H. Blackwell	<b>Art Unit</b> 2176	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 November 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 August 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to an amendment filed 11/25/2005 with a priority date of **09/03/1997**.
2. Claims 1-8 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 7 and 8 are independent claims.
3. Objection to the Specification has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-2, 4-5, and 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helman et al. (hereinafter Helman, U.S. Patent No. 6,400,371 filed 05/18/1998, issued 06/04/2002) in view of Shimizu et al. (hereinafter Shimizu, U.S. Patent No. 5,943,680 filed 01/30/1995, issued 08/24/1999).

**In regard to independent Claim 1 (and similarly independent Claim 8),**  
Helman teaches *identifying the document as comprising a hypertext markup language document* (Col. 2, lines 57-67: teaches displaying on television web pages using HTML).

Helman also teaches *reading a color from the document, the color specified in a YUV format* (Col. 4, lines 51-58: teaches set colors within a document and on Col. 3, lines 30-36: teaches YUV format).

Helman fails to teach *reading a plurality of display elements from the document, each of the plurality of display elements specifying a corresponding absolute position*. However, Shimizu teaches an information processing apparatus that includes a composition device (compiler) for composing document data, graphic and image data. The compiled source is device independent relying on a output control device to produce displayable or printable output based on the characteristics of those devices (see Abstract).

Shimizu further teaches the concept of a current active position (CAP) to which elements such as graphics or image files are inserted into the source to be compiled together to form an intermediate (compiled/DVI) file. The current active position gets affiliated with each element of the document once the document is compiled into the DVI file (Col. 5, lines 5-30; 53-65; Col. 6, lines 25-26 (teaches offsets applied to an absolute position of an element); Col. 8, lines 39-42, lines 59-64). It would have therefore been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Helman and Shimizu as both inventions related to operations with compiled structured markup documents. Adding the teaching of Shimizu strongly suggests that absolute positions would have associated with at least graphic and image elements once tags that command for their insertion were compiled. The act of inserting the tags into the document source would have effectively defined absolute positions of

Art Unit: 2176

such elements once the document was compiled into a DVI file. One benefit of Shimizu's teaching would have allowed for offsets to the absolute positions to have been applied depending on which device the output was directed to for display.

Helman continues by teaching that *each of the plurality of display elements corresponding to one or more hypertext markup language (HTML) tags in a source document from which the document was compiled* (Col. 4, lines 51-67: teaches displaying plurality of elements using HTML tags in document).

Helman also teaches *rendering each of the plurality of display elements on the television at the corresponding absolute position* (Col. 4, lines 4-14: teaches television for displaying the page and on Col. 4, lines 59-67: teaches displaying plurality of elements). Helman fails to teach *absolute positioning*. However, Shimizu teaches output to a display suggesting that a TV could be one of such displays. More importantly, as argued above, Shimizu does teach absolute positioning related to elements that are used to offset positions of elements once they are rendered to a particular device. It would have therefore been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Helman and Shimizu as both inventions related to operations with compiled structured markup documents. Adding the teaching of Shimizu strongly suggests that absolute positions would have associated with at least graphic and image elements once tags that command for their insertion were compiled. The act of inserting the tags into the document source would have effectively defined absolute positions of such elements once the document was compiled into a DVI file. One benefit

of Shimizu's teaching would have allowed for offsets to the absolute positions to have been applied depending on which device the output was directed to for display.

Helman fails to teach *reading a color palette from the document, the color palette specified in a YUV format*. However, though Shimizu does not expressly teach a YUV color palette (typically describes RGB 24 bit or less to grayscale), it does teach that such a color palette is constructed and stored in a database and is included in the source to be compiled into the DVI file (where it is read by the compiler) (see Fig. 3) and again when it is read while being converted to a device-specific file for display. It would have therefore been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Helman and Shimizu as both inventions related to operations with compiled structured markup documents. Adding the teaching of Shimizu provides a mechanism for incorporating RGB, and with modifications many other color palettes into the source, compiled source, and subsequent device-dependent files.

Helman fails to explicitly teach *compiled hypertext markup language document (CHTML)*. However, Shimizu does teach compiling a source document (markup is tagged, structured like HTML) into a device independent form for subsequent conversion to a device-specific form for display (see earlier rejection and rationale). It would have therefore been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Helman and Shimizu as both inventions related to operations with compiled structured markup documents. Adding the teaching of Shimizu provides a mechanism for compiling a structured markup source file into a device-independent form for subsequent conversion to a device-specific form for display.

**In regard to dependent Claim 2,** Helman teaches *wherein the plurality of display elements includes at least one of a line element, a rectangle element, and a circle element* (Col. 5, lines 3-6: teaches different types of display elements).

**In regard to dependent Claim 4,** Claim 4 contains subject matter, which is similar to that found in Claim 1, and is rejected along similar lines of reasoning.

**In regard to dependent Claim 5,** Helman teaches *wherein the plurality of display elements includes at least one text element, the text element including a font, a size, a style, and a color, the text element occupying no more than one line on the television* (Col. 4, lines 59-67: teaches text or image elements). It is noted that Shimizu teaches similar limitations (Col. 4, lines 30-59).

**In regard to independent Claim 7,** Claim 7 reflects the method of interpreting a document as claimed in Claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale.

In addition, Shimizu teaches *a communication medium* (Fig. 1 shows components connected together by a common thread).

Shimizu does not explicitly teach a television and a set top box. However, Shimizu does teaches a display, printer and a CPU to which one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have found it obvious to have substituted and used the claimed components for the display and CPU of Shimizu. Using a similar argument, Shimizu also teaches that *the set top box coupled to the communication medium and the television*.

Art Unit: 2176

6. Claims 3 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helman in view of Shimizu, and in further view of Hill et al. (hereinafter Hill, U.S. Patent No. 6,023,714 filed 04/24/1997, issued 02/08/2000),

**In regard to dependent Claim 3**, neither Helman nor Shimizu teach *wherein the plurality of display elements includes at least on link element, the link element including a uniform resource locator (URL) of a corresponding linked item*. However, Hill teaches a URL for the linked document (Col. 6, lines 37-44). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Hill into Helman and Shimizu to provide a way to display hyperlink with a URL as one of the plurality of elements to be displayed which will identify linked document in order to enhance the browsing of HTML documents in a network environment.

**In regard to dependent Claim 6**, neither Helman nor Shimizu teaches *wherein the plurality of display elements includes at least one Java class element*. However, Hill teaches JavaScript embedded in HTML document (Col. 8, lines 48-64).

Hill also teaches that a document interrogates capabilities of the display such as color palette (Col. 9, lines 23-28). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Hill into Helman and Shimizu to provide a way to display HTML document with embedded JavaScript for display of Java elements in order to permit interactions with objects within a document in a document processing environment.



***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments, see amendment, filed 11/25/2005, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-8 under Helman, Hill, and Mighdoll have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Helman in combinations with Hill and Shimizu. Shimizu teaches a similar document processing and display system as that claimed and in combination with the other references teaches the amended claims.

***Conclusion***

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James H. Blackwell whose telephone number is 571-272-4089. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

9. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather R. Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2176

10. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

James H. Blackwell  
02/16/2006

*William L. Bashore*  
**WILLIAM BASHORE**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**  
*2/17/2006*